

## REMARKS

Claims 1-58 stand rejected in the present Office Action, dated October 19, 2007. Applicants have amended claims 1, 18, 36 and 40. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, following the present response, claims 1-58 are pending in the application.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

All the independent claims, 1, 18, 36, and 40 standard rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182447) in view of Davallou (U.S. Patent No. 6,976,019).

According to the Office Action, “Schilling did not explicitly disclose determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis,....” Office Action, p. 2.

To cure this deficiency of Schilling, the examiner cites Davallou. In particular, the examiner cites col. 3, lines 38-62 for the notion of detecting whether an input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis. Office Action, p. 3.

Column 3, ll. 38-62 discloses, in relevant part, the following:

In this respect, if a user is looking for a particular keyword/web site, and the keyword/s s/he enters does/do not match any data existent on the database/web, the engine would perform a second search with ***words that best match the sounds*** of the typed word/s ***in the user's language (or various languages)*** to see if a more accurate match can be found in the database/web.

What Davallou fails to perform is making a determination for likely ***candidates*** for multilingual analysis. In other words, Davallou never asks the question whether a URL is a likely candidate or multilingual analysis or is not a likely candidate. Rather, after regular searches have failed in Davallou, it switches to phonetic searching in the user's language (or various languages). Col. 2, ll. 30-54 and col. 3, ll. 38-62.

In contrast, the recited subject matter, is smart about making the aforementioned determination:

The current design, as described above, sends any URL with a period and without spaces to NRP 240 because NRP 240 can handle multilingual domain names, such as Chinese characters, in the domain name. ***However, it would be desirable to minimize the sending of names to NRP 240*** [responsible for multilingual analysis] ***that NRP 240 is unlikely to resolve because there is a***

*roundtrip performance degradation associated therewith* and NRP 240 is not always operationally reliable. Since the main value that NRP 240 adds is multilingual domain name resolution, *it would be desirable to add a step of determining whether or not multilingual domain name resolution issues are present.*

Specification, p. 4, ll. 15-21. Davallou does not have such a determination step, as recited in all the independent claims. Davallou has no way to avoid such “roundtrip performance degradation” as described above.

Accordingly, the Applicants maintain that claims 1, 18, 36, and 40 patentably define over the cited art. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended some of the independent claims, thereby further limiting how the determination step in question is performed.

The Applicants turn the Examiner’s attention to at least the following passage for support of the amendments made to the independent claims:

Advantageously, instead of blindly passing the user typed URL input NRP 240 for multilingual domain name resolution, the invention uses intelligence when deciding to redirect. Thus, the invention provides algorithm(s) to detect that the user typed URL is a likely candidate for a multilingual domain, and only when this is true, is the input redirected to NRP 240. Since, other than the multilingual domain opportunity, NRP 240 cannot handle the user typed URL error, it is wasteful to route to NRP 240 unnecessarily.

While a variety of rules based choices could be implemented to detect a multilingual domain name, in an exemplary embodiment, the definition for multilingual domain name is:

(1) the input includes at least one character inside the domain portion that has a code point above 0x0080, although a normalized dot is not counted as above 0x0080, (2) the domain portion does not include normalized space and (3) the domain portion includes at least one normalized period (‘.’) but the period is not leading or trailing.

Specification, p. 15, l. 22 – p. 16, l. 4.

Thus, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 18, 36, and 40 patentably define over the cited art in view of the remarks made above, and the amendments made to the claims. Insofar as claims 2-17 and 55, 19-35 and 56, 37-39 and 57, and 41-54 and 58, depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 18, 36, and 40, respectively, they also

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0767/186581.01  
**Application No.:** 10/073,618  
**Office Action Dated:** October 19, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims 1-58 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Schiling in view of Davallou.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Greg Plichta at 206-902-2461.

Date: October 31, 2007

/ Grzegorz S. Plichta /  
Grzegorz S. Plichta  
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439